DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 027 CS 200 576

AUTHOR Jaffe, Samuel
TITLE Interdisciplinary Approaches--Past and Present--to Foreign Language and Literature Studies.
PUB DATE Oct 72
NOTE 8p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Modern Language Assn. (14th, St. Louis, October 26-28, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Elective Subjects; German; German Literature; *Graduate Study; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Language Instruction; *Language Programs; Language Role; Languages; Literature; Literature Programs; Medieval History; Modernism; *Undergraduate Study; *World Literature

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses some past and present interdisciplinary approaches to foreign language and literature (FLL) studies. It is argued that the current unpopularity of FLL studies in the United States is the consequence of falling away from viable traditions of scholarship and teaching in this area. A model for reform which reawaken interest in FLL studies, is outlined using Germanic languages and literature as an example. An undergraduate program is proposed which is organized around a study of a number of historical periods in which the conflict between traditionalism and modernism is especially sharp. This program would use perspectives from political, social, economic, legal, cultural, and intellectual history to inform FLL studies. It is also suggested that a number of special elective courses for non-majors be offered dealing with narrow topics of broad interest, such as "The Literature of National Socialism." Recommendations are also made for an interdisciplinary program of FLL studies on the graduate level. (DI)

Samuel Jaffe

Interdisciplinary Approaches-Past and Present-to Foreign Language and Literature Studies

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 077027

The current malaise afflicting foreign language and literature (FLL) studies in the United States has at least one beneficial concomitant; it virtually compels, on pain of professional extinction, a critical re-examination of the assumptions upon which we students and teachers of FLL have been proceeding - with all too little success - in the recent past. There are, of course, those who will reject the notion that the assumptions of our practice have anything to do with the present quietly desperate state of the profession. The manifest decline in vitality and viability of FLL studies is attributed, rather, to external factors largely beyond our control - cultural, social, political, above all economic trends, which must be simply waited out. On the other hand, the somewhat too comfortable fatalism of this position is balanced by the naive expectations of those romanticists of "innovation", whose faith in the limitless possibilities of tinkering remains as generally ineffectual as it is refreshing. This position paper attempts to steer a middle course between the "fatalistic" and "romantic" points of view. Against the former it is urged that self-criticism and internal reform can significantly improve our situation and, in particular, that a new appreciation of the interdisciplinary character of FLL studies has much to contribute to such constructive revision. Against the latter it is maintained that reform of FLL studies from an interdisciplinary perspective, although potentially valuable, represents no panacea but rather one among many useful approaches to a revitalization of our profession.

Underlying every proposal for change is an explicit or implicit critique of the status quo, a critique itself based upon some stated or unstated principles of evaluation. Neither a detailed critique of the total situation in FLL studies nor an intensive exploration of the principles of evaluation underlying such a critique can be offered within the compass of this brief position statement. Instead, a useful point of departure seems to present itself in the phenomenon of apathy, even hostility, to FLL studies so prevalent throughout the society. Not only in government and foundation circles, not only in business, industry, labor, the media, among the beautiful people, the ugly people, left, right, center, the silent majority and loud minority, the silent minority and loud majority, the public at large, but also - treacherously - among students at all levels and - most treacherously - among our colleagues in teaching, scholarship, and the administration of teaching and scholarship, FLL studies seem to be distinctly out of favor. Are we, however, to equate "out of favor" with "out of fashion" and suggest that our present unpopularity is the result of brave adherence to a great tradition despite the whims of fortune? Against this obviously simplistic rationalization of our recent history I would like to propose for the sake of discussion what is perhaps an equally gross counter-thesis - that the current unpopularity of FLL studies in the United States is not the result of adherence to a great tradition, but rather the consequence of falling away from it. This is an historical thesis and, in the following, I shall attempt to provide some substantiation, first with a few examples from the pre-history of modern FLL studies and then with a number of cases selected from the history of my own FLL discipline, the study of Germanic languages and literatures. Subsequent to the historical argumentation, I shall outline one concrete model for reform (specified again with respect to the study of Germanic languages and literatures) and discuss its potentialities for reawakening interest in FLL studies as well as for revitalizing teaching and scholarship in the area.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Samuel Jaffe
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

CS 200 576

The studia humanitatis of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, the dawn of the Italian Renaissance, represent the transformation and augmentation of the old trivium within the late medieval septem artes liberales; from the new grouping logic is excluded, but grammar and rhetoric are retained and to them are added poetry, history, and moral philosophy. This cycle of studies is the earliest modern precursor both of "classical philology" (in the sense of Altertumswissenschaft or "classical scholarship") and of "modern philology" (including, of course, FLL studies). A number of features of the studia humanitatis are noteworthy in comparison with later developments. First, exponents of the studia humanitatis do not see their studies as autonomous "scholarly" or "academic" pursuits, the relation of which to the surrounding culture and society is, at best, problematical. On the contrary, there is a distinct emphasis on the contribution of the studia humanitatis to civic virtue, to "the perfection of the man as Citizen." Such perfection, a process of cultivation at once individual and social-political, is achieved through reconstruction and interpretation of the exemplary culture of Classical Antiquity. Ancient grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history, and moral philosophy provide the tools of reconstruction and interpretation; they are, at the same time, part of the exemplary culture to be reconstructed and interpreted. From the standpoint of matter as well as method the studia humanitatis are quite "inter-disciplinary"; much that we adepts of FLL studies have long since banished from the realm of "literature" to that of "history" still constitutes part of the subject-matter of the studia humanitatis. Characteristic, however, of all the varied treatments of various texts is a common ethos: love of the word and striving to elucidate its protean manifestations as a guide to the mystery of man's past, present, and future. In the humanism of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries philology once again seems to partake of the sacral; here lies the germ of a conflict with established theology perceived by sensitive spirits of both parties.

By the time of Friedrich August Wolf (1759-1824), founder of the modern German school of classical scholarship, the relationship between philology and theology had run its sometimes tranquil, sometimes stormy course. With "the legal independence of the teaching profession, its definitive separation from theology," Wolf's doing, the union of sacred and profane letters so characteristic of traditional humanism was finally dissolved. The secularization and professionalization of philology evident in Wolf's concept have both a positive and a negative aspect. Independence, on the one hand, releases enormous energies which can be devoted to the work of internal organization and development; on the other hand, by comparison with the studia humanitatis, the critical philology of a Lorenzo Valla, the cultural, religious, and political reformism of an Erasmus, the Christian rationalism and neo-stoicism of much 16th and 17th century humanistic philology, e.g. Justus Lipsius and Hugo Grotius, Wolf's Altertumswissenschaft seems relatively isolated from the problems and vital concerns of its time, much more a purely "scholarly" or "academic" pursuit. And yet the contemporary relation is there, albeit in a form vastly different from the civic activism, critical reformism, rationalistic and stoic mastery promulgated by previous humanisms. Conceived and born out of a situation of personal, social, and political impotence, Wolf's programmatic Darstellung der Alterthums-Wissenschaft bears, from the standpoint of its relation to reality, all the features of sublimation and compensation, inner emigration from the facts and flight to an ideological front where German Hellenism reigns triumphant, in spite of the attempts of "unholy

hands" to wrest the "Palladium" of classical scholarship from the "fatherland." Something of the spirit of Wolf's motivation is evident in the dedication to Goethe, in his eyes the patron-saint of German Hellenism: "G o e t h e, der Kenner und Darsteller des Griechischen Geistes, empfange wohlwollend den mit Liebe dargebrachten Anfang einer Sammlung von Schriften und Aufsätzen, die bestimmt sind hin und wieder das weite Gebäude von Kenntnissen aufzuklären, in welchen jener das Leben verschönernde Geist ursprünglich wohnte. An wen unter den Deutschen könnte man bei einem Unternehmen solcher Art eher denken, als an den, in dessen Werken und Entwürfen, mitten unter abschreckenden modernen Umgebungen, jener wohlthätige Geist sich eine zweite Wohnung nahm?...Denn woher liess solche Erhebung über die engen Kreise und Tummelplätze des gewöhnlichen heutigen Lebens, woher liessen solche Ansichten von Welt und Kunst und Wissenschaft sich gewinnen, als aus dem innern Heiligthume der alterthümlichen Musenkünste, welches sich endlich einmal wieder in einem natürlich verwandten Gemüthe aufschloss?... Ihr Wort und Ansehen, würdigster unserer Edeln, helfe hinfort uns kräftig wehren, dass nicht durch unheilige Hände dem Vaterlande das Palladium dieser Kenntnisse entrissen werde; wie wir denn gegründete Hoffnung hegen, daran ein unverlierbares Erbgut für die Nachkommen zu bewahren. Wo auch der Grund zu suchen sei, in der Natur unserer Sprache, oder in Verwandtschaft eines unserer Urstämme mit dem Hellenischen, oder wo sonst etwa: wir Deutschen nach so manchen Verbildungen stimmen am willigsten unter den Neuern in die Weisen des Griechischen Gesanges und Vortrages, wir am wenigsten treten zurück vor den Befremdlichkeiten, womit jene Heroen andern den Zutritt erschweren; wir allein verschmähen immer mehr die einfache Würde ihrer Werke verschönern, ihre berühmten Unanständigkeiten meistern zu wollen. Wer aber bereits so viel von dem göttlichen Anhauche daheim empfand, dem wird der ernsthafte Gedanke schon leichter, in den ganzen Cultus der begeisternden Götter einzugehen...So werde, so bleibe der Deutsche, ohne die Emsigkeit des bloss gelehrten Sammlers zu verachten, ohne den blossen Liebhaber allgemeiner Bildung zurückzuweisen, überall der tiefere Forscher und Ausleger des aus dem Alterthume fliessenden Grossen und Schönen; und er gebrauche solche Schätze, um unter dem Wechsel wandelbarer öffentlichen Schicksale den Geist seiner Nation zu befruchten, deren Bessere durch das Studium einheimischer Werke keineswegs unvorbereitet sind die höhere Weihe zu empfangen."

The relative loss of substance, the ideological defence-mechanisms involved in the relationship of Wolfian Altertumswissenschaft to contemporary social and political reality, are associated with a remarkable organization and systematization of the definitively secularized and professionalized discipline, a development, however, foreshadowed not only by the encyclopedism of the Enlightenment but also by the polyhistorism of the seventeenth century. If, in Wolf's system, there is relatively less emphasis on the extra-historical functionality of the disciplines, their redeeming social value (n.b. the absence of moral philosophy from Wolf's scheme), than in the studia humanitatis and their successors, this is overshadowed by the many elaborations and specializations of traditional disciplines - all designed to serve the end of historical criticism and reconstruction. Philology, in the hands of Wolf, is more "inter-disciplinary" than ever: "The philologists,whom he trained, were not restricted to dealing with literary works; they were all-round scholars in Antiquity who knew just as much about history and archaeology, not to mention the many ancillary disciplines with which their master had equipped them." Christian universalism, secularized

and professionalized, may be mingled, in the conception of Wolf's Altertumswissenschaft, with a frustrated (and hence idealizing) proto-nationalism; the "inter-disciplinary" universalism of earlier humanistic philologies is, however, more than evident in the twenty-four fields of study distinguished by Wolf within the general province of his "Science of Antiquity."

With Jacob (1785-1863) and Wilhelm (1786-1859) Grimm and Karl Lachmann (1793-1851) the study of Germanic languages and literatures has its origin, the birth of "modern philology" out of the spirit of a burgeoning nationalism - not untempered by the influence of traditional humanistic universalism. For Lachmann as well as the brothers Grimm "the patriotic motif of that cult of national antiquity was decisive in relation to their scholarly endeavors." And Jacob Grimm, in his memorial to Lachmann, characterized not only the deceased, but also himself and his brother, when he praised Lachmann's patriotism: "Es ist schon vieles werth an einer stätte das licht der welt erblickt zu haben, wo gute sitte herkömmlich fortgepflanzt wird...Noch höher anzuschlagen scheint es, dasz der mensch auch in einer groszen zeit geboren sei, die gewaltiges ein und aus athme. jedwede zeit hat ihre thaten und leiden, ihre vorkämpfer und zurückdränger; wer aber, edlen sinnes, in den jüngeren geschlechtern, denen ihre hofnungen für das grosze deutsche vaterland eine nach der andern gedämpft und genommen werden, dürfte sich messen mit dem aus lastender schwere des feindlichen drucks empor getragnen siegesfrohen und überseligen enthusiasmus der jahre 1813, 1814, 1815? In des erstarkenden knaben schuljahre, in des jünglings erste studentenzeit muste noch geheimer groll über Deutschlands schmach, dann aber freudige ahnung fallen, dasz sich das blatt bald gewendet haben werde. man denkt sich mit welchem jubel, in welcher gesinnung die endlich erschallende kunde der befreiung vernommen wurde, zu welchen eignen thaten sie ermunterte. eben seine erste gelehrte arbeit entlassend trat Lachmann als freiwilliger in die reihen des feldzugs von 1815 und erwarb sich von nun an das recht ein Preusze zu heiszen und zu sein, wie er es bis an sein lebensende treu geblieben ist. seine die vorrede schlieszenden worte lauten mutig so: nec mihi otium suppetit, cui eo festinandum est, quo hoc tempore viros omnes, quorum apta armis aetas est, pio ac forti animo properare decet. Seine das ganze leben hindurch auf die freiheit des vaterlands, des geistes und des glaubens gerichtete denkungsart bedürfen meiner anerkennung und meines preises nicht. einige den meisten unbekannten zeugnisse dafür könnte ich geltend machen, wenn ich wollte oder das überhaupt hier passend wäre; denn ich gehe darauf aus seinen wissenschaftlichen character darzustellen, der freilich enge mit seinem öffentlichen und sittlichen leben zusammenhängt."

The connection between upright conduct in public life and scholarship - an echo of the studia humanitatis, Erasmus and Thomas Morus, Hugo Grotius? Only that honor and public life in 19th century Germany turn on the problem of achieving national statehood in a modern sense. Where Wolf takes comfort from reconstruction of an idealized Antiquity with a special relationship to the German spirit, Lachmann and the Grimms take heart from a rediscovery of that spirit itself, as it is manifest in the heritage of German Antiquity. To be sure, Lachmann and Jacob Grimm approach this task in quite different ways; common to both approaches is, however, an "inter-disciplinary" view of scholarship rooted in basic acceptance of the philological universalism definitively formulated by Wolf. Where Lachmann and Jacob Grimm differ, it is a question of relative emphasis and aims within the panoramic scope of this scholarly cosmos, a disparity - in Grimm's formulation - between "philologists...who pursue verba for the sake of res and those

who pursue res for the sake of verba." Thus: "Mann kann alle philologen, die es zu etwas gebracht haben, in solche theilen, welche die worte um der sachen, oder die sachen um der worte willen treiben. Lachmann gehörte unverkennbar zu den letzteren und ich übersehe nicht die groszen vortheile seines standpuncts, wenn ich umgedreht mich lieber zu den ersteren halte." Lachmann is characterized, in other words, as a student of "things," i.e. philological subject-matter disciplines (such as the history of language), for the sake of "words," i.e. the criticism, reconstruction, and interpretation of texts; Grimm characterizes himself as a student of texts for the sake of subject-matter disciplines (principally the history of language). Obviously the distinction is a relative one, the relationship of the two genera philologiae complementary rather than exclusive: textual criticism provides material for the history of language (as well as for the other philological subject-matter disciplines); history of language and its sister-disciplines are indispensable in the practice of textual criticism. The specific contributions of Lachmann and Jacob Grimm consist in the development of methodological advances within their chosen fields of emphasis, Lachmann's "objective" method of "common errors" in the field of textual reconstruction (recensio), Jacob Grimm's elaboration of the comparative method as applied to the history of language. The over-all validity of Wolf's "inter-disciplinary" system of philology remains, however, unchallenged in the theory and practice of the Grimms as well as of Lachmann.

The "inter-disciplinary" character of the study of Germanic languages and literatures is nowhere more apparent than at the gathering which was, in large measure, responsible for conferring upon its adepts their currently popular trade-name - Germanisten. The first convention of "germanisten" was held from the 24th to the 26th of September 1846 in Frankfurt am Main. The title "germanist" had previously been restricted to students of German law. Jacob Grimm, elected to presiding officer of the convention, proposed a deliberate extension of this usage; henceforth the name of "germanist" was to apply to students of German language and history as well as German law. Grimm himself represented all three disciplines in his own person, one basis (among others) for his choice as Versammlungsleiter, albeit he indicated that he had come to regard the study of language ("sprachforschung") as his primary field of scholarly activity. Thus, the Germanist appears on the modern scene as more than a scholar in "Germanic languages and literatures." He is an exponent of three basic disciplines susceptible of further division into a philological-historical cosmos at least approximating the universality of Wolf's Altertumswissenschaft and united in the common task of building national identity on the basis of German Antiquity. The mission of germanistic legal studies as well as philology and history was, according to Jacob Grimm, "to resurrect a background, upon which the fatherland can look back with pride, because all the monuments of our antiquity not only should nourish the present but also reach into the future."

The career of Germanistik in the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries is intimately bound up with the fate of German nationalism. The delicate balance between nationalism and universalism in the attitudes of Lachmann and the Grimms, their breadth of philological-historical interest and competence, finds a continuation in the work of their spiritual progeny, Wilhelm Scherer (1841-1886) and Erich Schmidt (1853-1913). But the transformation of nationalism into chauvinism is accompanied by increasingly subjectivistic and irrationalistic, therefore anti-historical and anti-philological, trends

in German intellectual life, particularly in Germanistik, evident around 1910. Emphasis on "spirit" and "life" at the expense of historical reality and philological detail lead to emptiness rather than freedom, to a narrowing rather than a broadening of view-point. Konrad Burdach (1859-1936), a late representative of the great tradition in Germanistik, is, with his warnings against subjectivism and gnosticism, isolated by 1925. The period of National-Socialism witnesses the final degradation of German nationalism to chauvinism and, in germanistic scholarship, the tendency toward reduction of the philological-historical cosmos to the irrationalisms and racisms of a bastard metaphysics.

The development of Germanistik since 1945 has been characterized, in ever increasing degree, by the creative renewal of traditions largely submerged by the dominant 20th century currents just touched upon. The posthumous discrediting of 19th century nationalism by 20th century racist chauvinism has led to a reawakening of ideological universalism; the collapse of irrationalistic literary metaphysics has led to a rediscovery of methodological universalism, the philological cosmos in all its dimensions. This universalism, in both the ideological and the methodological sense, is strikingly manifest in the enormous influence exercised upon the development of post-war Germanistik by a Romanist, Ernst Robert Curtius. In many respects Curtius is the Homer of German literary scholarship after the fall, its heros ktistes. He combines the features of many of the philologists and philologies already discussed; he prefigures the most significant traits of philologists and philologies present and - I would suggest - yet to come. Thus, a discussion of Curtius may well serve to introduce proposals for the future as well as a summary of the past.

Curtius shares the following general features with the great scholars discussed above: (1) His constant point of departure, reference, and return lies in the problems, needs, and vital concerns of contemporary culture, society, politics; (2) these problems, needs, and concerns are addressed in a process of consciousness formation through historical reconstruction; (3) the "foundation of all historical investigation" is philology, the "scientific technique" which establishes the empirical truths of history through analysis of texts; (4) in order validly to address the present through a reshaping of its historical consciousness, philological technique must be applied, in "inter-disciplinary" fashion, to a whole cosmos of texts (not only "literary"), developing methods appropriate to the analysis and interpretation of its heterogeneity. Where Curtius differs most significantly from the great philologists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Wolf, Lachmann, Grimm, Scherer, Schmidt, Burdach, is in his emphasis on supra-national Western universalism as a response to the challenge of the contemporary historical situation. The latter are exponents of a German nationalism more or less tempered by Western universalism; Curtius represents a Western universalism less, rather than more, tempered by German natioralism. It is this universalist tendency which determined Curtius' position as a simultaneous outsider-insider with respect to German culture, society, politics, as a mediator between Germany and the West, and, above all, as an active critic of "the barbarization of education and the nationalistic frenzy which were the forerunners of the Nazi regime." In 1932 Curtius published Deutscher Geist in Gefahr, a collection of anti-chauvinistic and anti-jingoistic essays on politics and culture, to which the Germanist Hans Naumann presented a proto-Nazi rebuttal with his Deutsche Nation in Gefahr. Even after the Nazi assumption of power Curtius offered intellectual resistance. Of the studies later collected and published as the epoch-making Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter (1948) a recent biographer has written: "During the long

night of German barbarity when Europe was fighting for its survival, Curtius wished by his monumental labor to affirm the permanence of Europe's humane tradition. Transferred now to the plane of Philologie, Curtius' wartime studies were a series of Streitschriften, the inevitable sequel to his Deutscher Geist in Gefahr. His ivory tower was in reality a command post from which he defended the values of a way of life and thought which reach back to antiquity." Curtius' critical élan recalls a philology prior to that of the nationalistic nineteenth century - the philologia militans of Christian Humanism.

Today, no more than in the past, can it be expected that our disciplines will flourish without a vital relation to contemporary social, cultural, and political concerns. Such concerns are not difficult to discover; the problem is to relate our teaching and scholarship to them, to relate them to our teaching and scholarship. A perspective useful for these purposes is "the historical conflict between traditionalism and modernism." Such a perspective is by no means restricted in its applicability to the period since the end of the eighteenth century. The struggle between traditionalism and modernism or modernization, in all dimensions of human existence, is a phenomenon characteristic of Western (and not only Western) culture and society from Antiquity to the present, albeit the "conflict of traditional and modernist values is most vivid in the new nations of the world." And for the philologist, the querelle des anciens et des modernes is a "constant phenomenon of literary history and literary sociology," even outside the Western tradition.

An exciting undergraduate program in FLL studies might be organized around the study of a number of historical periods in which the conflict between traditionalism and modernism is especially sharp. In setting up such a curriculum we would be well-adivised, in my opinion, to begin with a "literary"-historical periodization but to broaden and deepen our understanding through systematic application of perspectives derived from political, social, economic, legal, cultural, and intellectual history. Viewed from an "inter-disciplinary" perspective, under the aspect of conflict between traditionalism and modernism, the study of past "literature" is by no means irrelevant to the present, for we too are living in an historical period of bitter conflict between the "traditional" and the "modern.""Relevance"and the"inter-disciplinary" - they seem to belong together, to depend upon one another. No "literature" within the field of Germanic studies appears to be more "irrelevant" to most students than that written down ca. 750-ca.1050, during the "Old High German" period, - until this "literature" is presented, not "as literature" (i.e. as literature only), but in something approaching its historic multidimensionality. Then it becomes clear that this seemingly irrelevant corpus of writings documents an historical process of inestimable consequence for the Modern as well as the Medieval world, - the modernization of Germanic tradition through Christian and Classical culture. Many conflicts between contemporary traditionalists and modernists relate to aspects of human life also deeply involved in the process of 8th and 9th century modernization - power relationships between racial and ethnic groups, the relations between men and women, war-making, to name a few. It may be questionable whether or not "a lofty conception of women can be found in Tacitus and...is part of Germanic tradition," even more questionable whether or not said lofty conception - if it did in fact exist - genuinely represented "a peculiar respect and reverence for women." What is clear, however, is that the patriarchalistic sexism practiced by the new David and Solomon, i.e. Charlemagne, scarcely contributed to improving the position of women. It was a man's world. A man's world, too, in its lust for power, its racial, religious, ideological imperialism: "After four hundred years of fighting, the Franks had con-

quered what is, today, Western Europe. Charlemagne's empire represented the peak, the watershed and the moment of crisis in this development. Since he wanted to unite his conquered peoples spiritually, he had no choice but to subject them to his Carolingian imperial church. The much discussed Carolingian 'educational and cultural legislation' was an essential part of this process. The creation of academies and universities was never an end in itself, as later humanists have often preferred to believe. The object was the total subjection of the Arian, pagan, or superficially evangelized nations, to the one God-King, Christ, and his representative on earth, Charlemagne." Thus Friedrich Heer's description of Carolingian modernization.

From the foregoing discussion it will be clear that the "modernization" of FLL studies here proposed-for undergraduate education- would amount to modernization from within the framework of the traditional major, adoption of a broader inter-disciplinary perspective on material already current. If it can be done for Otfrid and the Hildebrandslied, by the way, it can be done for Goethe and certainly for Kafka. In addition to such "modernization from within" (at the same time an "antiquization from within" according to the historical argument sketched above), we should offer a number of special elective courses for undergraduate non-majors as well as for undergraduate majors, courses dealing with narrow topics of broad interest. I think here of course titles such as the following: "The Literature of National-Socialism"; "German Youth Movements"; "The Marxist Tradition of Literary and Cultural Criticism in Germany"; "Women in Medieval and Modern German Literature"; "The Conservative Tradition in German Literature and Culture"; "Jews in Medieval and Modern German Literature"; "German Mysticism." Undoubtedly courses of similar scope and interest could be instituted in FLL areas other than the Germanic; we Germanisten may have some advantages, but no monopoly on the capacity for provocation.

At the graduate level draconian measures are undoubtedly in order - one or two years of initiation into the arcane mysteries of historical-philological scholarship followed by complete freedom for the student to pursue a research problem under the tutorial guidance of a specialist from his or her home department and also of an inter-disciplinary committee consisting of specialists from other departments interested in the project. Written qualifying examinations given upon completion of the initial one or two years of arcane specialization would be purely a departmental matter; approval of dissertation research would be, however, a matter for the inter-disciplinary committee as well as for the department. Such approval would involve three steps: (1) acceptance of a preliminary proposal; (2) acceptance of a final proposal; (3) acceptance of a final (oral) defence of the thesis.

Economic realities are much with us of late and rightly so, under the present grim circumstances. But there are many stylish disciplines which prepare students for little other than teaching - political science, sociology, anthropology, history, philosophy, comparative literature. If they wax fat while FLL studies wither away, is it not because they are believed - rightly or wrongly - to speak to deep personal and social concerns in a way inconceivable in the case of FLL studies? But we can and will speak to those concerns, if we return to that broader, more humane and humanistic conception of philology which this essay has attempted - most inadequately - to suggest.